

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
GREENVILLE DIVISION

Innovative Container Company, LLC,)
and Innovative Container Services, LLC,) C.A. No. 6:05-280-HMH
)
Plaintiffs,)
)
vs.) **OPINION & ORDER**
)
)
Son Light Trucking, Inc., Craig Raul)
Bunton, and Julian Cardona,)
)
Defendants.)

This matter is before the court on Innovative Container Company, LLC and Innovative Container Services, LLC's (collectively "Plaintiffs") motion to compel pursuant to Rule 37 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The Plaintiffs move to compel Son Light Trucking, Inc. ("Son Light") and Craig Raul Bunton ("Bunton") to fully answer interrogatories 10 and 11, and move to compel Son Light to fully answer interrogatory 21.

Interrogatories 10 and 11 seek communications concerning the collision at issue in this lawsuit. The Plaintiffs object that Son Light and Bunton's answers are devoid of detail and request that the court compel Son them to provide complete details concerning these communications. (Pls.' Reply Supp. Mot. Compel 1-2.) However, Son Light and Bunton have stated that they responded fully to the best of their recollection. (Defs.' Mem. Opp'n Pls.' Mot. Compel 1-2.) Therefore, the court denies the Plaintiffs' motion to compel with respect to interrogatories 10 and 11.

The Plaintiffs further allege that they are entitled to the information requested in interrogatory 21 to Son Light concerning violations of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations ("FMCSR"), 49 C.F.R. 390.1 et. seq. After review, the court grants the

Plaintiffs' motion to compel, but limits the time frame for which Son Light is ordered to respond. Therefore, Son Light is ordered to "[s]et forth all actual violations or allegations of violations (from any source) of the FMCSR over the past" five (5) "years that are known to Son Light relating to the driver, vehicle, and/or collision and the circumstances surrounding any such violations or alleged violations." (Pls.' Mem. Supp. Mot. Compel Ex. A (Interrogatories).)

Therefore, it is

ORDERED that the Plaintiffs' motion to compel is denied in part and granted in part.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Henry M. Herlong, Jr.
United States District Judge

Greenville, South Carolina
January 12, 2006